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Dear Professor,

Thank you very much for your e-mail dealing with our manuscript sent for publication in BMC infectious Disease (Ms ID: 1458862786701781). Thanking you for your kind invitation to resubmit our article after making revision. This version has been revised according to the reviewers’ recommendations. All specific requests are now changed and included in the text. The English of the manuscript has been thoroughly checked.

All modifications included in the revised version, are marked in red.

Please find enclosed point-by-point answers to reviewers’ comments and the revised manuscript that we hope acceptable for publication in BMC infectious Disease as regular paper.

A point by point
Answers to reviewers’ comments

We thank the Reviewers for their constructive comments.

All answers to reviewer’s comments are inserted below in bold character and in red in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer # 1: Sylvia Bruisten
This revised version answers all questions raised by me before to a satisfactory level. Some minor essential revisions are however still needed:

1. In the Methods section the semi-nested PCR to amplify the ompA region of Chlamydia trachomatis has been improved in the sense that is more detailed. However, for one of the most essential ingredients, the sequences of the primers, the authors refer to their previously published paper (ref 8). I think it much better to include the sequences
of all used primers in the present paper even when these primers were taken from previously published papers, such as from Lan et al.

**The sequences of the primers and their corresponding references were added in the text.**

2. In the Results section Table 3 is no longer present in the revised version.
Line 552 still mentions this table. Please change into Table 2.
**We have changed table 3 into table 2 as your request.**

3. Discussion:
Line 565 states 'in our country' However, Tunisia is much larger than only the city of Sfax. Therefore it will be more accurate to state that 'the prevalence in our city of Sfax was 4.2%, which is expected to be representative for all Tunisia' (if this is correct of course).
**The expression ‘in our country’ was changed as you recommended.**
Line 642: 'latter' in stead of 'latters'
**The word latters was removed from the text.**

Editorial requirement:
Copyediting: After reading through your manuscript, we feel that the quality of written English needs to be improved before the manuscript can be considered further.
**The spelling and grammar errors are now corrected by a Professor teaching the English language.**
Some expressions are rewritten clearly and concisely, the English of the text has been thoroughly checked.

Thanking you
Yours sincerely
PhD. Houda Gharsallah